

1 DAVID T. BIDERMAN, Bar No. 101577
JUDITH B. GITTERMAN, Bar No. 115661
2 M. CHRISTOPHER JHANG, Bar No. 211463
PERKINS COIE LLP
3 Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 2400
San Francisco, CA 94111-4131
4 Telephone: (415) 344-7000
Facsimile: (415) 344-7050
5 Email: DBiderman@perkinscoie.com
Email: JGitterman@perkinscoie.com
6 Email: CJhang@perkinscoie.com

7 Attorneys for Defendant Google Inc.

8
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION**
11

12 CLRB HANSON INDUSTRIES, LLC d/b/a
INDUSTRIAL PRINTING, and HOWARD
13 STERN, on behalf of themselves and all others
similarly situated,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 GOOGLE, INC.,

17 Defendant.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CASE NO. C O5-03649 JW

**DECLARATION OF M.
CHRISTOPHER JHANG IN
RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'
OPPOSITION TO GOOGLE INC.'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS
UNDER SEAL IN CONNECTION
WITH GOOGLE INC.'S REPLY TO
PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL
OPPOSITION (DOCUMENT NOS. 171-
172)**

Date: June 11, 2007

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: Courtroom 8

Judge: Honorable James Ware

1 I, M. Christopher Jhang, hereby declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in all of the courts of the State of
3 California and this Court, and am an attorney with the law firm of Perkins Coie LLP, counsel for
4 defendant Google Inc. ("Google") in this action. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(d), I submit
5 this declaration in response to the Declaration of Michele F. Raphael In Opposition To
6 Defendant Google Inc.'s Administrative Motion For Leave To File Documents Under Seal In
7 Connection With Google Inc.'s Reply To Plaintiffs' Supplemental Opposition To Google Inc.'s
8 Motion For Summary Judgment ("Plaintiffs' Opposition to Seal Documents"), filed with this
9 Court on May 30, 2007 (Document Nos. 171-172). I have personal knowledge of the facts set
10 forth below except as to those matters stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I
11 believe them to be true. If called upon to testify, I could and would testify competently as to the
12 matters set forth herein.

13 2. Google's Reply To Plaintiffs' Supplemental Opposition To Google's Motion For
14 Summary Judgment ("Google's Supplemental Reply") contains, discusses, or refers to
15 information or documents that Google considers to be confidential, proprietary, or trade secret
16 information. It discusses the operation of Google's AdWords system and references deposition
17 testimony of Google's software engineers regarding Google's internal processes and information
18 not available to the public, including proprietary technology related to the AdWords program and
19 the development of new technology.

20 3. The deposition transcripts of Google's witnesses, portions of which are attached
21 as Exhibits A, B, and C to the Supplemental Declaration of M. Christopher Jhang In Support of
22 Google's Supplemental Reply ("Supplemental Jhang Declaration"), are confidential, in whole or
23 in part, as set forth in the declaration supporting Google's motion to seal. *See* Declaration of M.
24 Christopher Jhang In Support of Google Inc.'s Motion For Leave To File Documents Under Seal
25 In Connection With Google Inc.'s Reply To Plaintiffs' Supplemental Opposition To Google
26 Inc.'s Motion For Summary Judgment, ¶¶ 5-7. Notably, these transcripts that are the subject of
27 Plaintiffs' complaints are the result of additional discovery ordered by the Court regarding "how
28

1 the AdWords system compensates for fluctuations in Internet traffic” – an issue that clearly calls
2 for the discovery of confidential and proprietary information. *See* Court’s February 8, 2007
3 Order.

4 4. Plaintiffs’ claim that Google has improperly sealed the deposition transcript of its
5 employee, Heather Wilburn, is unmerited. Exhibit A of the redacted version of the Supplemental
6 Jhang Declaration is redacted in accordance with Google’s tailored confidentiality designations.

7 5. Google will continue to confer with Plaintiffs in good faith regarding Google’s
8 confidential designations. Once the designations are finalized, Google will amend its redacted
9 documents to conform with the final designations.

10 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United
11 States that each of the above statements is true and correct.

12 Executed June 1, 2007, in San Francisco, California.

13
14 **PERKINS COIE LLP**

15
16 By: /S/
17 M. Christopher Jhang
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28